

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Final Office Action dated September 21, 2007 the Examiner indicated that Claims 2-43 and 52 were allowed. However, several of these claims are amended as shown above. For example, Claim 12 is amended to remove the limitation "based on a value of said at least one property said precision" because this limitation is believed to be unnecessary to distinguish Applicant's invention over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to carefully all claims afresh. To enable the Examiner to re-consider the allowability of these claims, this amendment is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

#### **Claim 48**

In paragraph 3 on page 3 of the Final Office Action, Claim 48 was only objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim. Hence, Claim 48 has been re-written in independent form, but not including all intervening claim limitations (e.g. Claim 47's limitations have not been included). The Examiner is respectfully requested to carefully review the re-written claim and determine its allowability in view of the above claim changes.

#### **Claim 53**

In the Final Office Action, Claim 53 was rejected only under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being drawn to non-statutory subject matter. See the middle of page 2 of the Office Action.

At the end of the explanation, the Examiner stated towards the bottom of page 2 that "The rejection may be overcome by providing a practical application for the result such as the last step of Claim 12, e.g." Hence, Claim 53 has been amended as per the Examiner's suggestion. Therefore, allowance of Claim 53 is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 44-47, 49-51**

In the Final Office Action, Claims 44-47, 49-51 were also rejected only under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being drawn to non-statutory subject matter. See the top of page 3 of

the Office Action. The Examiner stated that "The objects encoded in the memory as recited in the claims are mere data indicating values or property."

Accordingly, Claim 44 is amended to require an instruction to use at least the floating-point value, and display a result of the use. For support of this amendment to Claim 44, see for example FIG. 4C and also page 57 at lines 23-26. In support of "display" see, for example, item 135 in FIG. 1C. Therefore, allowance of Claim 44 is respectfully requested. Claims 45-47 and 49-51 depend from Claim 44 either directly or indirectly and are therefore also believed to be in form for allowance.

#### New Claims 54-83

Note that new Claims 54 to 83 are added herewith. Support for several limitations of these claims can be found in a number of corresponding original claims. For example, Claims 54 and 55 are supported by the respective claims 45 and 46 that were originally filed. Moreover, Claim 56 is supported by claims 47-49 as originally filed. Also, Claim 57 is supported by claim 51 as originally filed.

#### Conclusion

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 378-7777, extension 113.

Respectfully submitted,



Omkar K. Suryadevara  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 36,320